

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-15 are pending in the application, with 1, 9, 11, and 14 being the independent claims. Claim 9 is sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,348,742 to MacPherson (herein "MacPherson"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that MacPherson does not describe each and every element as set forth in amended independent claim 9. Specifically, claim 9 as amended recites "*wherein said fuse corner pad is incapable of being bonded to an external electrical connection.*" (Claim 9, *emphasis added*) Even if MacPherson teaches a corner pad (which Applicants do not concede), MacPherson does not describe a "fuse corner pad [that] is incapable of being bonded to an external electrical connection." Instead, MacPherson describes bond pads where "[b]ond pads are used both . . . and as connection points for bond wires to create an electrically conductive pathway between the package pins and the device." (MacPherson, Col 4, Ln. 52-55). Thus, MacPherson does not describe each and every element as set forth in amended independent claim 9

because the bond pads are configured for electrical connection, in contrast to Applicants' claim 9.

Accordingly, MacPherson does not teach each and every feature of Applicants' claim 9 and therefore does not anticipate claim 9. Dependent claim 10 depends from independent claim 9 and therefore is also distinguishable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above, in addition to its own patentable features. Therefore, Applicants request the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be removed and these claims be passed to allowance.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-2 and 5-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,054,334 to Ma (herein "Ma"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that Ma does not describe each and every element as set forth in independent claims 1, 9, 11, and 14. Specifically, claims 1, 9, 11, and 14 recite a fuse corner pad located at a *corner* of either a semiconductor die or integrated circuit. Ma does not describe a pad located at a corner of either a semiconductor die or integrated circuit. Instead, Ma locates pads only on sides of a silicon substrate and chooses not to locate pads in the corners, despite availability of space in the corners, as shown in Ma's figures 1, 2, 7, and 9. For example, FIG. 2 clearly shows that pads 12 are not located in the corner's of the substrate 9. (*See*, Ma, FIG. 2) Thus, Ma does not describe each and every element as set forth in independent claims 1, 9, 11, and 14.

The Examiner is reminded that the current rejection is an anticipation rejection. It is respectfully pointed out that anticipation can only be established by a single prior art reference that discloses each and every element of the claimed invention. RCA Corp. v.

Applied Digital Data Systems, Inc., 730 F.2d 1440 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Based on the discussion above, Ma does not teach each and every feature of Applicants' claims 1, 9, 11, and 14 and therefore does not anticipate claims 1, 9, 11, and 14. Dependent claims 2, 5-8, 10, 12-13, and 15 depend from their respective independent claims 1, 9, 11, and 14 and therefore are also distinguishable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above, in addition to their own patentable features. Therefore, Applicants request the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be removed and these claims be passed to allowance.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

On page 5 of the Office Action, claims 3-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ma. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and respectfully request this rejection be removed and this claim be passed to allowance.

Dependent claims 3-4, which depend upon independent claim 1, are allowable for at least being dependent from an allowable independent claim, in addition to their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request this rejection be removed and that these claims be passed to allowance.

***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Jeffrey T. Helvey  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 44,757

Date: 3/28/06

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600

507594\_1.DOC